

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS -P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/785,555	02/24/2004	Cary B. Cochenour	040073	8139		
75	90 09/20/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
Craig G. Cochenour, Esq. Buchanan Ingersoll PC			WILLIAMS, F	WILLIAMS, KENNETH C		
One Oxford Cer			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
301 Grant Street			3739			
Pittsburgh, PA	15219		DATE MAILED: 09/20/2003	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before th	e Filing	of an	Appeal	Brief		

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/785,555	COCHENOUR ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kenneth C. Williams	3739		

Advisory Action	10/785,555 COCHENOUR ET AL.		۱L. }			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenneth C. Williams	3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 01 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI	HE REPLY FILED <u>01 September 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 106.07(f).	E FIRST REPLY WAS F	TILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da).	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offite of the final rejection,	iate extension fee clice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 		IE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	Illowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi wided below or appended.	II be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the affidar	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	nea.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b See Continuation Sheet.	•		nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s).	$\supset ()$			
13. Other:		1 /20	/X)			
		LINDA &	M. DVORAK			
			PATENT EXAMINE			
		GROU	JP 3700			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 11.

MPEP 715.07 states in order for a 1.131 affidavit to show priority of invention, any satifactory evidence of fact can be used. FACTS, not conclusions, must be alleged. The allegations of fact might be supported by submitting as evidence one or more of the following:

- (A) attached sketches;
- (B) attached blueprints;
- (C) attached photographs;
- (D) attached reproductions of notebook entries;
- (E) an accompanying model;
- (F) attached supporting statements by witnesses, where verbal disclosures are the evidence relied upon. Ex parte Ovshinsky, 10 USPQ2d 1075 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989);
- (G) testimony given in an interference. Where interference testimony is used, the applicant must point out which parts of the testimony are being relied on; examiners cannot be expected to search the entire interference record for the evidence. Ex parte Homan, 1905 C.D. 288 (Comm'r Pat. 1905);
- (H) Disclosure documents (MPEP § 1706) may be used as documentary evidence of conception.
- 37 CFR 1.131(b) provides three ways in which an applicant can establish prior invention of the claimed subject matter. The showing of facts must be sufficient to show:
- (A) reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference; or
- (B) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to a subsequent (actual)
- with due diligence from prior to the reference date to a subsequent (actual, reduction to practice; or
- (C) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date to the filing date of the application (constructive reduction to practice).

The examiner finds that the applicant has not sufficently provided evidence to overcome prior art rejections in light of MPEP 715.07 and 37 CFR 1.131(b).